

AUGUST 26, 1952
129th BROADCAST

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 300 Stations of the ABC Radio Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

How Can We Assure Integrity in Public Life?

Moderator, QUINCY HOWE

S p e a k e r s

THEODORE R. McKELDIN

BLAIR MOODY

—★—
COMING

—September 9, 1952—

America's Position in the Pacific

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 18, NUMBER 15



\$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

Vol. 18

No. 15



How Can We Assure Integrity in Public Life?



The Broadcast of August 26, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., over the American Broadcasting Company Radio Network, originated from the Ritz Theater, New York City.



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN—Republican Governor of Maryland. One of eleven children, Governor McKeldin was born in Baltimore at the turn of the century. He was educated in Baltimore public schools and Baltimore City College, receiving his law degree in 1925 from the University of Maryland. A life-long Republican, he began his political career two years later as executive secretary to Mayor William F. Broening. In 1943 he was elected Mayor of Baltimore and seven years later won the governorship with the largest majority ever given a gubernatorial candidate. In the recent Republican National Convention Governor McKeldin gave the nominating speech for General Dwight D. Eisenhower.

BLAIR MOODY—Democratic Senator from Michigan. In April, 1951, newspaperman Blair Moody was appointed to the Senate by Governor Williams of Michigan to fill the seat of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg. Up to that time he had had no party affiliations but in general supported New Deal policies. Born in New Haven, Conn., he earned a B. A. in Economics at Brown University in 1922 and the following year became a sports writer for the *Detroit News*. In 1933 he was appointed Washington correspondent for his paper and authored the well-known "Lowdown on Washington" column as well as serving as moderator of the radio and TV panel "Meet Your Congress." Senator Moody played a prominent role in the Democratic National Convention and is currently conducting his first campaign for election to the Senate.

Moderator: QUINCY HOWE—ABC network radio commentator; Associate Professor of Journalism, University of Illinois.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year. (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

How Can We Assure Integrity in Public Life?

Moderator Howe:

Just two speakers will devote our full 45-minute program to the discussion of a major campaign issue with the usual questions from our Town Hall audience.

There's no disagreement between Democrats and Republicans about the importance of integrity in government. Everybody endorses integrity; everybody denounces corruption. But how can we assure integrity in public life?

Governor Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin of Maryland, a life-long Republican, as his name implies, made the nominating speech for General Eisenhower at the Republican National Convention last month. As co-author of a book entitled *The Art of Eloquence*, Governor McKeldin naturally did a bang-up job. I heard him do it. He is a former mayor of Baltimore, and when he ran for the governorship of Maryland Free State in 1950, he won by the largest majority in history.

Governor McKeldin has distinguished himself by reorganizing his state's government, and cutting expenses, including even cutting taxes.

From the Democratic side, we shall hear from Senator Blair Moody of Michigan who recently served as Chairman of the Rules Committee at the Democratic National Convention. As senator, Blair Moody was cited for statesmanship by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report for his share in leading the fight for efficiency and economy in government and especially for putting through in the Senate the resolution that took the Department of Internal Revenue out of politics.

Senator Moody is also co-sponsor

with three other senators of the so-called "Clean Government Bill of 1952" which would tighten loopholes in the laws and increase penalties for the corrupters and for the corrupted.

Well, to start things going, let's start off with Senator Moody.

Senator Moody:

Well, thank you very much, Quincy Howe, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Governor McKeldin. In the last two years, we American people have witnessed a strange and dangerous development in our national life. We have seen partisan irresponsibility, for sheer lack of political integrity, grow to a point where in my judgment it may threaten the peace of the world and our very existence as a nation.

Mr. Howe, America has entered into a period of great peril. We are confronted with the greatest threat that free men ever faced—a world-wide communist conspiracy which seeks to stamp out freedom and establish total domination over the bodies and minds and souls of men. We are faced not only with a relentless and ruthless foe, but also with a military and manpower potential which dwarfs anything that has ever menaced the American people before.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at a point in our history, obviously, where we simply must make the right decisions on the great matters of government and world policy that face us. Our whole future depends upon that. I am glad that both nominees for president of the United States, both Governor Stevenson and General Eisenhower, agree on this great and fundamental point. We are

in greater danger than ever before and our future is at stake in what we do now and in the next four years.

Now how do we avoid the catastrophe to the world and our civilization that a world atomic war would be? Well, there are certain things we must do as a nation. What are they?

First, we must build such strength that even the most powerful, sinister, and godless dictatorship in history will dare not attack us, will know that to launch an attack on the free world would mean suicide for the aggressors.

Second, we must provide vigorous and intelligent leadership for the free world. Our enemies must be prevented from swallowing up our allies, for if they did that, they would add that allied strength to their strength and they would choke our strength and power by depriving us of the crucial raw materials we must have to keep our own industrial system going.

Third, of course, we must dedicate ourselves to sustaining a stable and strong national economy. This is the base not only of our strength to keep the peace; it is also the foundation for moving ahead from the greatest era of production and prosperity in the history of our Nation to even higher standards of living for our people and an even greater future for our nation.

Mr. Howe, how does this fundamental tie in with our subject tonight—political integrity? In my judgment, simply this way: that on these issues where it is essential that the people get the facts, issues that should be above all question of partisan politics, there has been a lack of political integrity; a campaign of twisting and distortion never before paralleled at least in our modern history.

We are told on the one hand that we can have the strength we need for our safety, but on the other hand we can't afford to pay for it. We are told that the Mutual Security program, without which we would shortly be left isolated and weakened, is a giveaway program which can be quickly crippled and wrecked, without fear. We are told, believe it or not, that American foreign policy—which, despite some mistakes, of course, because every human institution does make mistakes—that foreign policy, the one great force in the world which has stood up against and blocked the Reds, well, we are told this was fashioned or was influenced by the Reds.

And we are told that the actions taken by the Government to stabilize our economy during this period of mobilization for peace—actions essential to preserve our very free system, if you please—are socialism.

Now this is the framework around which I should like to discuss, with the distinguished Governor of Maryland, the subject of political integrity; the question of how we can establish complete political integrity in our land so that our country and our people will be protected against the dangers of the day.

In a word, the best way to achieve this in my judgment is for the people themselves to get and insist upon the facts, to become so intimately familiar with the real issues, that the disciples of fear, ignorance, bigotry and smear will destroy themselves by their own reckless and dangerous irresponsibility.

Moderator Howe:

Thank you, Senator Moody. Now

the Republican Governor of Maryland Free State, Theodore R. McKeldin.

Governor McKeldin:

Thank you very much, Quincy Howe, and our distinguished Senator Moody from Michigan. If you don't mind, I would like to say especially the American Legionnaires I see in this audience from my own state of Maryland. (*Applause*)

The American people have the power to insure integrity in public life. The instrument long has existed. Recently, they have neglected to use it properly. I mean, of course, the American two-party system.

When one party becomes insolent and negligent of the people's best interests through its growing power and long tenure, the people must assert their sovereignty, remove the offenders, and install the other party in power.

The new officials will be enthusiastic about cleaning up the mess of corruption and exposing that which still has not come to light. The ousted party will regroup and reorganize under new leadership. It will become the loyal opposition and watchdog over the party in power. But to accomplish this, the initiative must be with the people.

After the voters act, the immediate responsibility passes to the party winning the election, and I believe its first move, Mr. Howe, should be to end the secrecy with which public business is transacted in Washington. Secrecy in the handling of the people's money breeds corruption. The sale of Maritime Administration oil tankers at a scandalously low figure which permitted the promoters to make a terrific profit through resale, for example, could be accom-

plished only behind closed doors.

Tax liabilities are forgiven. In back rooms with the curtains drawn, the Internal Revenue Bureau operators claim they are operating under Section 55 which makes it a criminal act to reveal the contents of income tax returns except to authorized persons, but Section 55 was never intended to protect tax-dodging gangsters or to permit collectors to forgive tax liabilities without public knowledge.

It was never intended to deny legitimate information to the Congress. Racketeers have invaded and in some areas almost taken over the legitimate liquor business because Treasury bureaucrats decided the methods for handling federal permits were none of the public's business. The law provides for the denying of liquor permits to persons of bad moral character, but if district supervisors for the Alcohol Tax Unit turn down dubious applications for permits, the matter can be appealed to Washington and often the appeals are taken by politically powerful attorneys and often the decisions of the district supervisors are reversed.

The blindfolding of the public has made possible the corruption in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the North African Airbase larcenies of public funds, and other thefts or misuse of the people's tax money.

Let us bring public business into the open. Of course, the human element always is involved in official morality. And the next administration in Washington must get first-rate men of unquestioned honesty to handle the public funds and the investigation of corruption. The party which has been too long in power cannot attract such men. There are few who

want to associate their names with those who have been responsible for the corruption.

Why, just over the week end I read that Senator Estes Kefauver, one of the great crime fighters in the Congress, announced that he was not interested in overtures from the Stevenson organization for him to become the Attorney-General if Governor Stevenson should win the presidency. Senator Kefauver wants his freedom to fight crime. He doesn't want to be hamstrung by the Truman-Stevenson palace guards. (*Applause*)

Moderator Howe: Well, it sounds as if we are getting just a little touch of politics into the discussion. How about it, Senator Moody?

Senator Moody: Well, Mr. Howe, first let me assure Governor McKeldin that he need have no fear, because Governor Stevenson will bring first rate-men to Washington in January. (*Applause*)

Second, I believe that any member of the Senate—and I am a candidate, as you know, for the Senate—would hesitate to give up his position in the United States Senate to enter the Cabinet in a tough job like that of Attorney-General. I can well understand why Senator Kefauver might hesitate to do that, even though that would not mean that he necessarily is casting any reflection on Governor Stevenson in that connection.

However, I would like to say this to you, Governor. I am very delighted to hear you come out strongly for open covenants openly arrived at. That is directly in line with my thinking on the subject. As you may know—I don't know whether you realized this when you said that—but I am the Chairman of the Anti-Censorship

Committee of the Senate. This committee was created as a result of a resolution I introduced because I felt that we should open up everything to the public.

The public's business should be open, unless there is a real reason why the security of the country would be violated if it were held secret. I thoroughly agree with you, sir, that this should happen.

Now, secondly, with regard to opening up the records of the Tax Bureaus and the RFC and so on, I believe that also, if you will check the Senate records, you will find that the bill which Mr. Howe referred to as the Clean Government of 1952—which, I might say, since you brought a political flavor into this thing, was blocked in committee by Republicans—was introduced by Senator Monroney of Oklahoma, Senator Sparkman, now our vice-presidential nominee, and George Smathers of Florida and myself as a bill which would provide for opening up of all the books of the RFC and of all those things, most of them, that you have talked about.

I hope you may be able in the next session of the Congress to use your nearby influence from Baltimore and convince your Republican colleagues in the Senate that this should not be a matter they should block. This so-called M-2 S-2 Bill or the Clean Government Bill is a bill which I believe should be passed.

I'd like to tell you what it is. It's a bill which would tighten up the laws against the tax fix by making it illegal, specifically illegal and punishable by jail sentence, for anyone except a taxpayer himself or his lawyer or accountant of record to make any intervention in any manner whatsoever in a tax

case. It would open up all of the books of the RFC except the private business of the company, of course, to examination not only by the public but by a newspaperman on a daily basis. There are a number of other features to this bill including, Governor, the imposition of mandatory jail sentences not only on government officials who violate their public trust but also on people who believe that they can go to Washington and corrupt officials down there. I think that the mandatory jail sentence feature of that bill, while it may sound a little rough, might do a great deal toward the cleaning up of our government. I would solicit right here your support among the Republican boys who blocked that bill in the next session of Congress.

Governor McKeldin: Well, you know, I think we're not really going to have much of a debate here because it looks like the Senator and I agree on all these things. You've got a bill that's going to clean up all that corruption. Well, that's what we want to do—clean up all of that corruption. I'm delighted to hear the Senator—as I knew, of course, he would—admit that this Administration is steeped in corruption and has been for many years, and I'm so delighted that my Democratic Senator from Michigan is instrumental in introducing a bill.

Now, of course, they've got, as you know, a tremendous majority of Democrats in the Senate and in the House, so a little Republican here and there trying to block a bill won't mean anything if the Democratic Administration is determined to clean up that corruption.

And I shall say I am so glad that we agree on everything. You

remember when the Oregon newspaper wrote to Governor Stevenson and said, "Why we'll support you, but we're afraid you can't clean up that corruption, that mess," that was the word he used, remember, "that mess." Stevenson sent back word and said, "Yes, sir, I think I can get some decent people around me, some honest people, and clean up that mess." And you remember when that was called to his attention, Harry said, "Well, what's this man Stevenson talking about. There isn't any mess down here." But Stevenson said and courageously so—I am not detracting from him—Stevenson said, "When you have a lot of corruption such as I see down there, when you have people indicted and send them to jail," Stevenson said, you remember, back to Truman, "that's a mess, wherever it is—whether it's in Illinois, whether it's in Washington, or wherever it is; that's a mess."

So you see the Senator and I start off agreeing that there's a mess. Now the only thing is, how can we best clean up that mess? He said that Governor Stevenson was going to come down to Washington. That's a nice thing for him to come down to the inauguration. General Eisenhower appreciates that.

Senator Moody: Well, now you have quoted Governor Stevenson out of context, or in fact, misquoted him quite freely, and you also, I think, obviously misquoted me. I didn't say anyone was steeped in anything. I should like to point out to you that when Governor Stevenson talked about the mess, I believe what he meant, Governor, was something like this: that the Republican party in the United States Senate for the last two years has sat by and per-

mitted to go ahead without any protest from its leadership the greatest campaign of falsification in American history behind the cloak, the sacred cloak, of Congressional immunity, whereby there could be no attack, no attack on the man or no suit against the man for character assassination.

Now, Governor, it is fashionable to blame this reprehensible situation upon one or perhaps a couple of Senators. That is not the case. These men that are nationally known for this irresponsibility are merely the hatchetmen for your party.

It is your party, sir, that has attempted to make the American people believe at a time when we must have national unity against Red Russia, that the policy of our Nation, which is the policy which has stopped Red Russia in its expansion, in its tracks—in Berlin, in Greece, and Turkey, in Europe—with the Marshall Plan, and in Korea—it is your party which has sought to deceive the American people into thinking that that policy has been dominated or influenced by the Reds. How silly can you get? How much do you expect to insult the intelligence of the American people?

Now, as the Senators that I am speaking of made their talk, the leaders of your party in the Senate sat there condoning and even urging that this be done. If you are close enough to Washington and Baltimore, you know that everybody in the Senate, everybody in public life knows what misstatements were made. And finally it got so thick and smelled so badly that little Margaret Chase Smith of Maine, a girl of great courage, got up in the face of her party leaders and said, "Look,

gentlemen, our party can't win and our country will lose if we continue a policy of fear, ignorance, bigotry and smear." I honor her for that. She's a Republican and the Republicans ought to be proud of her but not of the others.

Just recently—incidentally, there were seven, I believe, Republican Senators who had the courage and the decency to join with her in that protest against the leaders of your party, the rest of them didn't join—just recently another fine Republican Senator, Wayne Morse of Oregon, couldn't take it any longer, when he got up on the Senate floor and said, "I want to warn my party," and—I don't even have to read this one, I've got it here, I don't even have to read it—"I want to warn my party that if this campaign of distortion and twisting is not stopped the American people and the independent voters of America will become so disgusted with my party that it will lose what *was*," I might say but he said what *is*, "the best chance for victory it has had in 20 years."

Now that is the way the actions of the leaders and the majority of your party react on Republicans who insist on political integrity and I assure you, sir, that that is what Governor Stevenson meant when he said he would endeavor to clear up the mess in Washington. (*Applause*)

Governor McKeldin: Well, I just want to say that the man who is running for president on the Republican ticket is named Eisenhower, and that's the man who is fighting the very thing that you're talking about, whether it is sponsored by a Democratic McCarran or a Democratic Rankin. We are opposed to them wherever they are, and this man that we have

does not represent whatever element, Senator, that you're talking about now.

We're against smears. We are against character assassination wherever they are, whether they are from Wisconsin or whether they are from Rankin in the South. We are against it and this man will speak out for it and has spoken out for it and it's no use trying to sit back here and drag in one or two in the Senate that we have already exposed and already denounced.

Senator Moody: Governor, I am very glad to hear you say that, but I would just like to point this out to you. It is perfectly true that those Republicans whom you represent and a minority of the Republicans in the Congress, a very small minority in the House of Representatives, do feel the way you have just expressed. But have you ever thought of this one, Governor? That if General Eisenhower were elected president of the United States in November, and if he carried a Republican majority into the control of the Congress the men that I was talking about, the seniority men, would be the men who would control the Congress and the Congressional Committees? Do you remember when General Eisenhower was running for the nomination that he said that if his rival were nominated that we would return to isolationism and it might mean the difference between peace or atomic war and that was the reason he was a candidate? Well, is he now going to ask the American people to turn over the Congress, not only to that man as the most powerful man in the Senate, but to men who are far to the right domestically and far to the isolationist side of even

the man whom Eisenhower feared? Do you realize that the chairman of the Foreign Affairs committee of the House of Representatives, if the Republicans should carry the House, would be a man who is known as a Bertie McCormick Congressman? Do you realize that the man who would be the chairman of the Rules Committee of the House if the Republicans carried the House would be a man who is known as a Bertie McCormick Congressman? Do you know that another Bertie McCormick Congressman from my state, Mr. Clare Hoffman, would be the chairman of the Executive Expenditures Committee of the House in a Republican House?

And I won't go over the whole list. There are lots more. I would just like to add to you that the man who would be by law the chairman of the Committee of the Senate which would investigate the committee on government operations would be the Senator from Wisconsin whom you mentioned as the ringleader of this situation. Now how would you like that? In the face of that, how can you or Eisenhower or anybody else advocate for the American people the election of a Republican Congress?

Governor McKeldin: Well, I'll tell you, Senator, I believe that we have those who are supported by McCormick. McCormick has repudiated Eisenhower and McCormick is not supporting Eisenhower. I believe that when the election is over, and Eisenhower is elected, as you indicate, and we go to Washington, I believe that the vote that he gets of confidence will be such that some of the men that you speak about will have the courage and will certainly have

the character to follow the leadership of Eisenhower.

Now there was a man by the name of Truman who called in Eisenhower a short time ago and said, "I want you to tackle a tough job. I want you to go to Europe and I want you to organize the NATO." Now can you think of a tougher job than that? I am a one-world man. I believe that we are one people—I believe that—of one blood that God made all nations of men. That's the stand of Eisenhower. He went to Europe at the suggestion and the request of President Truman. And he did a magnificent job of organizing NATO. A man who can get the European nations together, can unify them—do you mean to tell me, Senator, that he's going to have a tough job with two boys down there in the Senate when he's . . . ?

Senator Moody: Just let me tell you something, Governor . . .

Governor McKeldin: Why, even some of your Democrats see the light, man.

Senator Moody: Just a second, look. Why sure, if he were elected president and he was right, of course, Democrats would support him, but look, you just said that McCormick was not supporting him. That's just what I'm telling you.

Governor McKeldin: I'm telling you, too.

Senator Moody: That these McCormick Congressmen wouldn't support him either and he'd be cutting his own throat by getting a Republican Congress.

Do you realize, Governor, that just a couple of months before the Congress adjourned, after a billion dollars had been cut away from the Mutual Security Program, and General Eisenhower along with the President and the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff warned the Congress, warned them that if they cut any more it would be—and I'm quoting Eisenhower—"dangerous to the security and safety of the American people"—do you know that the Republicans voted almost unanimously in the House to cripple that bill? Every Republican Congressman from my state including the man running against me voted to cripple that bill. It's just what I'm telling you. They won't support him if he's elected.

Governor McKeldin: That was as a General. If he says that to them as a president, they'll support him and you'll support him, too. You just said so.

Senator Moody: I said I'd support him if he was elected, which he's not going to be.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Howe: Now I see down in the audience for our first question, Mr. George H. Hallett, Jr. Executive Director of the Citizens Union, who has a very pertinent question to ask our two speakers.

Mr. Hallett: This is a question for both our speakers. What do

you think of the possible adaptation elsewhere of three ideas on which our Citizens Union and other civic groups are working here: One, advanced public hearing on proposed top-level appointments. Two, watchdog grand juries limited to wrong-doing in

public office. Three, non-partisan study and advice on qualifications of candidates for elected office.

Mr. Howe: Who wants to jump into that first? You, ready there, Senator Moody? I noticed that you were making some notes.

Senator Moody: Well, I was just noting the questions. I believe the idea of an advanced hearing on top-level appointments, and I'd like to ask the questioner, if I may, by whom he would have the hearing. Would it be made by the executive or the legislative? I'd like to know whether he would have that merely on offices that are confirmed by the Senate, for example, or whether he would have it on other offices. How top-level do you mean, sir?

Mr. Hallett: As proposed here in New York, we would have it on members of public boards and deputies in departments as well as heads of departments. That gives an idea of the kind of level we have in mind. Here we would propose that the hearings be held by the civil service commission. That could obviously be adapted to a situation in Washington.

Senator Moody: Well, of course, the top-level appointments are the responsibility of the executive, but I certainly see no objection to the public getting all the information about top-level appointments that it could have. I agree that there should be a maximum of information for the public about people who are appointed. I would certainly be opposed to having advanced hearings by a legislative body to advise the executive as to whom to appoint. That would be a clear constitutional cross-over which should not be committed. Naturally, this is new to me. I haven't heard it before, but it sounds as if it had a lot of sense,

and might work well on the federal level, although I don't believe I should say definitely whether I would advocate it. There might be some bugs in it that I don't see now.

Mr. Howe: How about on the state level, Governor? You know more about that level of Government. Let's have a little on that side of things.

Governor McKeldin: On the state level? I am inclined to be opposed to that. I believe that the responsibility under the constitution is exclusively that of the Governors, and I believe that if the Governor before making appointments would have to have an open meeting and call in all of the pressure groups from all over the state and give them hearings,—have a convention on all of your people, it would be a little difficult sometimes to get first-class people to serve. Sometimes even now, it's a little difficult to get first-class people to serve because public office doesn't have such a good reputation now, and if you are going to call that man in, have him interrogated by everybody in the state, I think you'd have a very difficult time—although I agree thoroughly with Senator Moody that we ought to make available all the information that we can to the public with reference to people we propose to appoint.

Senator Moody: If I may add a moment there, Mr. Howe, I do think that it would be a mistake to set up any system which would so hamstring the executive that he couldn't make appointments that might be urgently necessary because of the necessity of a long hearing or something of that sort. I don't suppose you would mean that. That's the reason I asked you how top-level do you mean.

I would say generally that the top officials of the federal government are subject to confirmation by the Senate, and if these men are all known pretty well by the Senate and if there is any objection to them, why, it's pretty clear that there would be someone in the Senate who would raise objections. Perhaps that would be sufficient.

Mr. Howe: Well, now let's go along and get the next question.

Man: Governor McKeldin, do those professional pressure groups known as the lobbyists exert a corrupting influence on our government?

Governor McKeldin: Well, that all depends, of course, on the people in charge of the government. If you have a legislative body that is weak, a legislative body that is subject to that kind of pressure, I am sure that they would exert a very corrupting influence. And of course that same influence has attempted to be exerted on the executive, too, when a bill is passed—whether to sign it or whether to veto it. There is an awful lot of influence brought there from these special groups. The only answer to that, of course, is still the human quality. You've got to have men of integrity, men of character in public office.

Mr. Howe: Now let's have the next question.

Lady: Senator Moody, don't you think that we have a responsibility to help those who engage in corruption, as well as those who are offended against?

Senator Moody: Help those who engage in corruption as well as those who are offended against? I don't quite understand your question, lady.

Lady: Help the corrupters. We

have a responsibility toward those people, yes.

Senator Moody: Well, it seems to me that there's altogether too widespread a practice in this country of considering that it is all wrong for a government official to accept a bribe—which, of course, is all wrong—but all right for someone else to give a bribe. Both are equally guilty in my opinion. And that is the reason why Senator Monroney and Senator Sparkman and Senator Smathers and I put them into this proposed law, which I am sure Governor McKeldin is going to help me put through, in equal measure. I don't know whether I've answered your question. I'm not quite sure I understood it, but that is my position on the comparative between the corrupted and the corrupter.

Mr. Howe: I think you have, Senator Moody. Let's have the next question.

Man: Governor McKeldin, if you believe the boss system of politics exerts the most corrosive influence in public life, what would you recommend to correct this deplorable system?

Governor McKeldin: The boss system?

Man: That's right.

Governor McKeldin: I don't believe that that's true. I believe that with able bosses, with men who have some character, I believe frequently that system is almost better than the open primary. I believe that. In the old days, for example—let me tell you this. When the bosses selected the United States Senators, rather than the people, I believe that we had much better United States Senators then than we have at the present time, of course, Senator Moody excluded. I don't mean him naturally.

Senator Moody: You said that just in time, but I don't agree with you anyway.

Governor McKeldin: I do not approve of the methods of Senator McCarthy. He is no part of my philosophy with reference to his approach.

Senator Moody: Well, Governor, I might point out to you that Senator McCarthy is hand in glove with the Wisconsin Republican machine in that state, and if there were a convention I'm quite sure that the leaders of that state would undoubtedly have nominated him again this year, so the convention system certainly wouldn't have cleared that situation.

Mr. Howe: Let's get on to the next question.

Governor McKeldin: Well, it depends of course on the character of the people. Now, of course, when Sophie Williams nominated you and somebody asked you what your politics were, you said, "I don't know if I am a Republican or a Democrat."

Senator Moody: I didn't say that.

Governor McKeldin: Well, you're so reported anyhow.

Senator Moody: I wouldn't have been nominated. Let me tell you that you want to join the newspaper business a while and get your quotes a little more accurately. I'm sure you mean well, but that was not an accurate quote.

Governor McKeldin: Well, Herman Talmadge in Georgia has that in his newspaper as having come from you. He said that you said that and that Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Jr., didn't run on the Democratic ticket—and you two controlled the Democratic Convention.

Senator Moody: If you were a newspaperman I would suggest

that you get a better source for your quotations than the Governor of Georgia, who apparently doesn't know what he's talking about.

Governor McKeldin: Want me to give you a few good quotations? Let me give you . . .

Mr. Howe: No, we've got to get on with the questions.

Governor McKeldin: Oh, no, I've got two good quotations. Let me give them.

Senator Moody: Well, I'm very sorry but we didn't control the convention. I might add this. We didn't try to either, because we were trying to hold the South in.

Governor McKeldin: Now I've got to give this quotation. July 13, that is just 13 days before the Democratic convention, at Camp Ripley, Minnesota, Governor Stevenson said, "I will shoot myself if nominated." On July 20, he said, "I couldn't, wouldn't, did not wish to be a candidate for president. I have not the fitness temperamentally, mentally, or physically for the presidency of the United States."

Mr. Howe: Now, let's get on to the subject, gentlemen. You're way off the subject.

Governor McKeldin: I just had to give those two quotations.

Mr. Howe: The governor is way out of order, I'm sorry. Let's have the next question.

Senator Moody: I'll say he's out of order.

Man: Senator Moody and Governor McKeldin. Do you agree that preappointment investigations by competent authorities will give a creditable amount of assurance for integrity among public and government officials?

Senator Moody: I didn't hear the first part of your question, sir.

Man: Do you believe that pre-

appointment investigations by government agencies will give a creditable amount of assurance for integrity among public and government officials?

Senator Moody: I believe that is the same question as the previous gentleman answered. I know Mr. Howe is in a hurry. I believe I'll let that one lie because we answered it previously, both the Governor and I. I'd like to comment on this Stevenson thing, but I know that Quincy doesn't want me to so I won't. He is highly qualified, I might add.

Governor McKeldin: Well, he said he wasn't. I wouldn't attempt to question him.

Senator Moody: He's just modest.

Governor McKeldin: Oh, I see. Very humble man. He'll be a great president.

Mr. Howe: One more question.

Man: A question to the Governor. Do you think that a three-week type of school sponsored by Governor Dewey and 7 other Governors seeing that the children know how much a policeman's salary is and just how much it costs and how many persons are to be elected and what are their financial backgrounds before being elected is necessary?

Mr. Howe: I'm afraid there just isn't going to be time, sir, for that question to be answered, because there's just exactly five seconds left and I've got to say now, thank you, Senator Moody and Governor McKeldin, for your interesting discussion of integrity in public life and a whole lot of other things. So be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell.



FOR FURTHER STUDY OF THIS WEEK'S TOPIC

Background Questions

1. What do the recent investigations of tax irregularities, RFC scandals, and political patronage, reveal about the present state of public morality?
 - a. Are the ethical standards of our public servants declining?
 - b. Or, have the consequences of unethical public conduct become more serious due to the increasing powers and responsibilities of government? e. g. the power to dispense huge sums of money in contracts, loans and subsidies.
2. To what extent can recent government scandals be attributed to the corruption or incompetence of our political leadership?
3. Does public virtue decline with tenure in office?
4. Is there validity in the contention that only a change of administration can eliminate corruption in government? Or, can a determined leadership set its own house in order?

5. Are public morals better or worse than the moral standards of the society as a whole?
 - a. Does political morality reflect or shape the standards of the society in which it operates?
 - b. Does evidence of unethical behavior in education, sports, social relations, etc., indicate that corruption in the United States runs deeper than politics?
 - c. Is public apathy toward corruption and acceptance of wrongdoing widespread?
6. Does the maintenance of high ethical standards in public life depend upon a revival of morality in our whole society?
 - a. Are grass-roots education toward group responsibility and greater community participation necessary?
 - b. What is responsible for the confusion of morality with legality? How can we eliminate what Senator Fulbright described as "operations in a shadowy region between what is legal and what is illegal?"
7. Should business groups, labor unions and other special interests, develop codes of practice and penalties for violation of these codes, to cover their members' conduct in dealing with the government?
8. Would an official code of ethics for public servants, as proposed by Senator Fulbright, assure integrity in public life?
9. Are Senator Douglas' proposals for a citizens' organization to work for better government on the national level and a commission on ethics in government to investigate general moral standards feasible?
10. Would a questionnaire covering financial activities of public employees, as was recommended by Newbold Morris, be an effective technique for exposing and controlling unethical dealings?
11. Can standards of public behavior be raised through legislation?
 - a. Will a clearer definition of what constitutes a crime and more rigorous law enforcement on every level of government insure maintenance of higher standards of conduct?
 - b. Should severe penalties for influence peddling and the giving as well as taking of bribes be imposed?
12. Would expanding civil service coverage and improving the civil service system raise standards of public behavior?
 - a. Will Congressional acceptance of the President's plan to take tax collection out of politics insure more ethical conduct in such matters?
 - b. Should rules governing advancement in public service be liberalized?
 - c. Are government employees provided with enough incentives, rewards, prestige, and recognition, to make public service an attractive career?
 - d. How can we promote more general respect for government service?
13. How can government improve its liaison with the people it serves?
 - a. How should government define the proper use of influence?
 - b. Is government capable of providing a full and fair opportunity for everyone to present his case?

BEHIND THE CRIER'S BELL

The ways of a program director, and how one gets into such a business, can make an interesting study. This is because "programming"—while it involves difficult and well-defined responsibilities—is not the logical, cut-and-dried goal of any college curriculum. Consequently, you find people in the field with intriguingly different backgrounds.

Take for example, Miss Harriet Halsband, who has been program director for TOWN MEETING, radio version, since last April. Miss Halsband came to Town Hall from another network discussion program, "Author Meets the Critics," which seems a logical sort of shift to make. Much more interesting and unusual, however is that prior to this, Miss Halsband was a practicing lawyer.

A native of Brooklyn, New York, she attended Smith College, majoring in government, then returned to work for a law degree at Brooklyn Law School. From then on, she worked in a private law office, with time out during the war years in the United States Department of Justice.

Two factors brought about the switch from law to radio, the first an omnivorous interest in reading. The second was the adjacency of her New York law office to that of Martin Stone, "packager" of "Author Meets the Critics." Five years ago she was invited to help produce "Author," and made her debut in the radio field.

Miss Halsband finds that legal training is a tremendous asset in lining up programs, "especially these days." A sharpened ability to see both sides of political and other issues has proved of the utmost importance. Also, in preliminary talks with speakers and in screening audience questions, she's automatically alert to possible libel or insult—an important asset to any discussion program.

Discussing TOWN MEETING specifically, Miss Halsband feels that the "times" may have imposed some changes on the program which are a little alarming.

"So much emphasis on politics and more politics has tended to cut down on discussions of the basic human issues, as we used to present them."

When the hub-bub of elections is over, she, for one, would like to see the return of many more broadcasts dealing with sociological and economic problems. And she is deeply interested to know what the general public thinks on this point.

Still, she finds TOWN MEETING a public service vehicle of great value. Its long history of presenting leaders from every field has brought home to people an important realization that there is at least "a little bit of right in everybody." She says it is up to TOWN MEETING to keep showing that on broad issues there can be honest disagreement among reasonable men.

While reading eight daily newspapers, the current magazines and books, and tuning in radio and TV programs around the clock is somewhat time consuming, Miss Halsband still has room for another great interest in life, "for a change of pace"—the Brooklyn Dodgers. It's impossible to keep baseball out of any conversation with her for long. In fact, she's such an ardent fan, she's had the same seat at Ebbets Field for the past ten years.